



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/506,289	08/31/2004	Johannes Petrus Maria Ansems	FR 020015	6740
24737	7590	09/12/2006	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ROY, SIKHA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2879	

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/506,289	Applicant(s) ANSEMS ET AL.	
	Examiner Sikha Roy	Art Unit 2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 August 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>0804</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The Preliminary Amendment, filed on August 31, 2004 has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "comprising" should be avoided.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,161,946 to Bishop et al..

Regarding claim 1 Bishop discloses (Fig. 1 column 3 lines 50- 67, column 5 lines 45-55, column 6 lines 14-24) an electric lamp comprising an elliptical reflector body 110 comprising a light emission window and surrounding light chamber and having first

Art Unit: 2879

focus 180 in the light chamber and a second focus 190 outside the light chamber, the reflector 110 includes a coating so as to reflect light towards the second focus, a light source is placed in the light chamber in the location of the first focus and a light transmitting glass cover 120 connected to the reflector body at the area of the transmission window. Bishop further discloses the glass cover is provided with a means (part 440 with a coating which suppresses infrared radiation) for blocking infrared radiation.

Regarding claim 2 Bishop discloses (column 5 lines 45-55) the means for blocking infrared radiation is a coating with multiple thin film layers of different dielectric materials, reflecting infrared radiation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,2,4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,241,382 to Daniel and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,281,620 to Yeh.

Regarding claim 1 Daniel discloses (Figs. 1-3 column 5 lines 24-45) an electric lamp comprising an elliptical reflector body 4 comprising a light transmission window and surrounding light chamber and having a first focus F1 and a second focus F2, a

Art Unit: 2879

reflector coating provided on the reflector body 4 which reflects visible light, a cover 6 connected to the reflector body 4 at the area of the emission window, a light source (filament) 3 is arranged in the light chamber in the location of the first focus F1 and the cover is made of a material that reflect infrared radiation.

Daniel discloses the second focus on the cover where it is connected to the fiber optic cable coupler end but does not exemplify the second focus outside the light chamber. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the second focus F2 of Daniel outside the chamber at a distance when the fiber optic cable connection is placed at a distance from the lamp.

Daniel discloses the cover reflecting both the visible light and infrared radiation and hence does not disclose the transmission of visible light through the cover.

Yeh in same field of endeavor discloses (Fig. 1 column 2 lines 20-45) an electric lamp 10 engaged in a glass reflector having a cover (glass lens) 16, transmitting visible light and having inner surface coated with IR reflecting material. It is to be noted this configuration of the lamp with the cover reflecting infrared radiation and transmitting all visible light improves lighting efficiency.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the visible and infrared reflecting cover of Daniel by visible light transmitting and infrared reflecting cover as taught by Yeh for improving light efficiency for the lamp.

Regarding claim 2 Yeh discloses (column 2 lines 27-31) the means for excluding infrared radiation is coating with IR reflecting material.

Regarding claim 4 Daniel discloses (column 6 lines 26-38) the reflector is characterized such that it transmits infrared radiation.

Regarding claims 5 and 7 Yeh discloses (column 2 lines 32-45) the cover is a parabolically curved cover and has a focus located on the light source.

Regarding claim 6 Yeh does not exemplify the cover being elliptically curved with two foci located on the light source. But this limitation is an obvious variation of Yeh's disclosure of the glass cover being elliptic instead of parabolic. Therefore a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would substitute an elliptically curved cover in place of a parabolically curved cover of Daniel and Yeh with two foci on the lamp for reflecting infrared radiation to the filament and heating the same.

Regarding claim 8 Daniel discloses a projector having the lamp and an optical fiber 9 whose end is located at the second focus of the elliptical reflector 4.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,241,382 to Daniel, U.S. Patent 6,281,620 to Yeh. and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,746,634 to Shimakura.

Regarding claim 3 Daniel and Yeh are silent about the cover being red or amber in color.

Shimakura in analogous art of vehicular lamp discloses (column 3 lines 32-37) an electric lamp having red-colored translucent cover emitting red light can be used as rear fog, tail or stop lamp in a vehicle.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a red colored cover for the visible light transmitting cover of Daniel and Yeh as suggested by Shimakura for emitting red light which can be used as rear fog, tail or stop lamp in a vehicle.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent 4,037,096 to Brendgord et al. discloses an electric lamp with a cover which transmits visible light but reflects infrared light. U.S. Patent 6,644,834 discloses use of ellipsoidal cover for some lamps.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sikha Roy whose telephone number is (571) 272-2463. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sikha Roy

Sikha Roy
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2879